MINI SMALL CLAMS TRIALS WORKSHEET #1A FIRST CASE - FACTS

PLAINTIFF IS THE ASSISTANT TO A NEWSPAPER DELIVERY BOY. DEFENDANT IS NEWSPAPER DELIVERY BOY. DEFENDANT BECAME SICK AND ASKED HIS HELPER, THE PLAINTIFF, TO DELIVER

FIFTY PAPERS. PLAINTIFF AGREED TO DELIVER THE PAPERS FOR \$3. PLAINTIFF DELIVERED PAPERS BUT DID NOT PLACE THEM IN MAIL BOXES OR INSIDE HALLS. I'VIDERS WERE RUINED IN THE RAIN, AND DEFENDANT REFUSED TO PAY THE \$3 TO THE PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF SUES.	WENTY-FIVE NEWSPA
1. WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?	
2. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE PLAINTIFF?	
0.11	
3. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT?	
4. What is the Judges' decision? Why?	

MINI SMALL CLAMS TRIALS WORKSHEET #1B

SECOND CASE -- FACTS

PLAINTIFF IS A BABY-SITTER. DEFENDANT IS A PARENT, THE PLAINTIFF AGREED TO BABY-SIT FOR THE DEFENDANT'S TWO CHILDREN FOR TWO DOLLARS PER HOUR. WHEN THE BABY-

SITTER ARRIVED, THERE WAS A THIRD CHILD, A COUSIN, PRESENT. PLAINTIFF SAID NOTHING ABOUT AN INCREASED RATE BUT DEMANDED THREE DOLLARS PER HOUR WHEN DEFENDANT REFUSED TO PAY THE ADDITIONAL ONE DOLLAR PER HOUR. PLAINTIFF SUES.
1. What are the issues?
2. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE PLAINTIFF?
3. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT?
4. WHAT IS THE JUDGES' DECISION? WHY?

MINI SMALL CLAMS TRIALS WORKSHEET #1C

THIRD CASE -- FACTS

PLAINTIFF IS A COMIC BOOK COLLECTOR. DEFENDANT IS A CLASSMATE. PLAINTIFF LOANED TEN COMIC BOOKS TO DEFENDANT FOR ONE WEEK. THE BOOKS WERE IN VERY GOOD CONDITION AND PLAINTIFF WARNED DEFENDANT TO BE CAREFUL WITH THEM THE PLAINTIFF HAD PAID \$2 A COPY FOR THE BOOKS OR A TOTAL OF \$2000 DEFENDANT RETURNED.

FME COMIC BOOKS IN GOOD CONDITION, BUT FME WERE TORN AND RIPPED. PLAINTIFF SUES.	PLANTIFF DEMANDED \$20.00 FROM THE DEFENDANT TO COVER COS	TS. DEFENDANT REFUSED.
1. WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?		
2. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE PLANTIFF?		
3. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT?		
11 MILE TO THE LECTO' PECKNICA MILA		
4. WHAT IS THE JUDGES' DECISION? WHY?		

MINI SMALL CLAIMS TRIALS WORKSHEET #10

FOURTH CASE -- FACTS

PLAINTIFF IS THE OWNER OF A TEN SPEED BICYCLE. DEFENDANT IS THE OWNER OF A BICYCLE REPAIR SHOP. PLAINTIFF BROUGHT THE BICYCLE INTO THE SHOP WHEN THE GEARS DIDN'T SHIFT PROPERLY, PLAINTIFF TOLD DEFENDANT/OWNER TO FIX THE GEARS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE BUT NOT TO DO ANYTHING THAT WOULD COST MORE THAN \$50.00. WHEN THE PLAINTIFF CAME TO PICK UP THE BICYCLE THE NEXT WEEK, HE FOUND THAT THE SHOP HAD INSTALLED BRAND NEW GEARS AND HAD SOLD HIS BROKEN GEAR SHIFT TO A BICYCLE USED PARTS COMPANY. THE DEFENDANT TOLD PLAINTIFF THAT HE WOULD PAY \$50.00 SINCE THAT WAS THE AMOUNT HE SAID WAS AS HIGH AS HE COULD GO. THE DEFENDANT SAID HE WOULD NOT GET THE BICYCLE BACK UNTIL \$100.00 WAS PAID. PLAINTIFF SUES.

USED PARTS COMPANY. THE DEFENDANT TOLD PLANTIFF THAT HE WOULD PAY \$50,00 SINCE THAT WAS THE AMOUNT HE SAID WAS AS HIGH AS HE COULD GO. THE DEFENDANT SAID HE WOULD NOT GET THE BICYCLE BACK UNTIL \$100,00 WAS PAID. PLAINTIFF SUES.
1. What are the issues?
2. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE PLAINTIFF?
3. WHAT ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE DEFENDANT?
4. WHAT IS THE JUDGES' DECISION? WHY?